

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent application publication 2002/0006133 to Kakemizu et al. (herein "Kakemizu"). That rejection is traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Applicant respectfully submits the claims as written positively recite features neither taught nor suggested by Kakemizu.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a mobile communication system in which a mobile node device transmits an authentication and accounting request for requesting a desired accounting service at an AAAH (authentication, authorization, and accounting home) server device. Then, the AAAH server device carries out an authentication and accounting process for packet communications by the mobile node device and carries out a processing for providing a desired accounting service according to the authentication and accounting request received from the mobile node device. Several features recited in claim 1 are believed to clearly distinguish over Kakemizu.

Independent claim 1 in further detail specifically recites:

the mobile node device having a transmission unit configured to ***transmit an authentication and accounting request for requesting a desired accounting service*** at the AAAH server device[.] (Emphasis added).

With respect to the above-noted feature the outstanding rejection cites Kakemizu at paragraph [0128].¹

In reply to that grounds for rejection applicant submits the noted disclosure in Kakemizu at paragraph [0128] does not disclose the above claim features. At paragraph [0128] Kakemizu discloses a mobile node 41 that can communicate with other terminal

¹ Office Action of November 20, 2006, page 2, last paragraph.

devices. That disclosure in Kakemizu is completely silent and does not even mention the above-noted claim feature of being able to transmit an authentication and accounting request for requesting a desired accounting service at the AAAH server device. Thereby, Kakemizu does not disclose the features of the “mobile node” positively recited in independent Claim 1.

Independent claim 1 further recites the AAAH server device including:

an information recording unit configured to record
*communication fee information regarding a communication
fee to be charged to a user* of the mobile node device[.]
(Emphasis added).

With respect to the above-noted feature the outstanding rejection cites Kakemizu at paragraph [0011] with reference to the noted “account process”.² However, applicant submits that disclosure in Kakemizu does not at all correspond to the above-noted claim features.

Applicant submits the noted disclosure in Kakemizu at paragraph [0011] does not at all indicate or suggest to record communication fee information regarding a communication fee to be charged to a user of the mobile node device. Kakemizu does not mention any *communication fee* information, and clearly does not indicate recording a *communication fee to be charged to a user*. Applicant submits the authentication, authorizing, and accounting processes noted in paragraph [0011] in Kakemizu would clearly have been understood to only refer to a usual authentication and accounting processes for packet communications provided by a conventional AAAH server. A communication fee as recited in claim 1 does not correspond to such a standard “accounting process” noted in Kakemizu. Applicant also notes the outstanding rejection has not indicated where Kakemizu discloses that such an “accounting process” would include a communication fee to be charged to a user of the mobile node device. Applicant submits it is not the case that a standard accounting process in an AAAH server would correspond to such a communication fee.

² Office Action of November 20, 2006, top of page 3.

Thereby, independent claim 1 recites further features that distinguish over Kakemizu.

Independent claim 1 also recites the AAAH server including:

a processing unit configured to carry out authentication and accounting processes for the packet communications by the mobile node device according to the communication fee information, and a processing for providing *the desired accounting service* according to the authentication and accounting request which is received from the mobile node device when it is judged that authentication succeeded according to authentication information contained in the authentication and accounting request. (Emphasis added).

With respect to the above-noted features the outstanding rejection cites Kakemizu at paragraphs [0019]-[0038].³

Applicant traverses that grounds for rejection and submit that disclosure in Kakemizu does not correspond to the claimed features.

The above-noted feature indicates the claimed processing unit carries out a processing for providing a desired accounting service, in addition to a usual authentication and accounting processes. The noted paragraphs [0019]-[0038] of Kakemizu do not disclose or suggest processing for providing such a desired accounting service. In fact, the noted paragraphs [0019]-[0038] of Kakemizu merely disclose service control information for use in providing a communication service, not an accounting service, along with a location registration request information and a location registration reply information (paragraphs [0019]-[0023]), or along with an authentication request, an address request, an authentication reply, and an address reply (Kakemizu at paragraphs [0024]-[0038]).

In such ways, Kakemizu further fails to disclose or suggest an AAAH server to carry out a processing for providing a desired accounting service requested by the authentication and accounting request received by the mobile device node.

³ Office Action of November 20, 2006, page 3, second paragraph.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicant respectfully submits independent claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, clearly distinguish over Kakemizu.

With respect to independent claim 7, the features recited therein are believed to also clearly distinguish over Kakemizu.

Independent claim 7 recites an AAA processing unit “receiving a desired accounting service, with respect to an AAAH server device ..., while receiving the packet transfer service at the mobile IP processing unit”. That is, the mobile node device of claim 7 receives the desired accounting service from an AAAH server device. Independent claim 7 also recites that operation while receiving a packet transfer service from a home agent device and a foreign agent device. Independent claim 17 recites similar features as in independent claim 7.

First, with respect to the rejections of claims 7 and 17, applicant notes the Office Action does not even address the specific features therein. Moreover, Kakemizu is not believed to disclose or suggest the above-noted features directed to the AAA processing unit, and thus independent claims 7 and 17, and the claims depending therefrom, are believed to also clearly distinguish over Kakemizu.

With respect to independent claims 11 and 18, the features recited therein are believed to also clearly distinguish over Kakemizu.

Claims 11 and 18 are directed to an AAAH server device and a method therein that recite specific features of an “information recording unit” and processing unit” (independent claim 11) and corresponding method operations (independent claim 18). Those features are already discussed above with respect to independent claim 1 as distinguishing over Kakemizu, and thus independent claims 11 and 18, and the claims dependent therefrom, also distinguish over Kakemizu for similar reasons as noted above.

With respect to independent claim 19, applicant notes the features therein have not even been addressed in the Office Action, and applicant further submits the features therein also clearly distinguish over Kakemizu.

Independent claim 19 is directed to a method that notifies a state of a mobile node from a prescribed server to a WWW server, and updates a display format of a prescribed display content for the mobile node according to the notified state of the mobile node at a WWW page provided by the WWW server.

As noted above the features in claim 19 were not specifically addressed in the Office Action, and applicant notes claim 19 recites different features than in independent claim 1, which were addressed in the Office Action.

Applicant further respectfully submits Kakemizu does not disclose or suggest updating a display format of a prescribed display content for a mobile node according to a notified state of a mobile node and a WWW page provided by the WWW server device, as recited in claim 19. Applicant also submits that it is apparent from the fact that Kakemizu does not even mention any display format of a display content for a mobile node at a WWW page. Thereby, Kakemizu is not at all even relevant to the features in claim 19.

Thereby, applicant respectfully submits independent claim 19 also distinguishes over Kakemizu.

With respect to independent claim 20, applicant respectfully submits the features therein also distinguish over Kakemizu.

The method of claim 20 recites features directed to requesting a confirmation of a host name or a set of a host name and a user name before a call setup procedure, comparing the identification information for the purpose of confirming a host name or a set of a host name and a user name, and then carrying out a call setup procedure between two terminal devices when an affirmative response is received.

The outstanding rejection did not even address the features recited in claim 20, and applicant notes claim 20 recites different features than in independent claim 1 addressed in the Office Action.

Further, applicant submits Kakemizu does not disclose or suggest requesting a confirmation of a host name or a setup of a host name and a user name before a call setup procedure, comparing the identification information for the purpose of confirming a host name or a set of a host name and a user device, and then carrying out the call setup procedure between two terminal devices when the affirmative response is received. Thereby, independent claim 20 is believed to also clearly distinguish over Kakemizu.

In view of the present response applicant respectfully submits each of claims 1-20 distinguish over Kakemizu.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423